



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,913	03/16/2005	Thomas Banik	2002P13626WOUS	9056
7590 07/25/2007 Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER NORTON, JENNIFER L	
			ART UNIT 2121	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,913

Applicant(s)

BANIK ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer L. Norton

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 41 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/22/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a **Final Office Action** in response to the Amendment received on 17 May 2007. Claims 21, 22, 24-30, 35, 36 and 38 been amended. Claims 41 and 42 are newly added. Claims 31, 34, 39 and 40 have been cancelled. Claims 21-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 41 and 42 are pending in this application.

Note: The Applicant has indicated the status of Claim 32 as currently amended, however the Applicant has not indicated any changes to this claim. The Examiner believes the status of the claim is mislabeled, and has interpreted the status of the claims as previously presented.

Drawings

2. The amendment to the Specification was received on 17 May 2007. The correction is acceptable and the objection to the Drawings is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 21 and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities:
Claim 21, line 4 and Claim 30, line 7 includes the grammatical error "an automation devices".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The amendment to the Claims was received on 17 May 2007. The correction is acceptable and the rejections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,813,532 (hereinafter Eryurek).

7. As per claim 21, Eryurek discloses a system for process interfacing within an automation scenario for distributed engineering systems, the system comprising:

a server (Fig. 33, element 912) for providing at least one application required for engineering (col. 35, lines 22-25 and col. 36, lines 37-43 and 50-54);

at least one client (col. 8, lines 56-62, col. 36, lines 28-36 and Fig. 1, element 14A and 30) for:

accessing automation devices (Fig. 1, element 15 and 16) that supply process data and/or project-planning data (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56), wherein the client is a programmable device (per inherency a client computer is a programmable device),

using the application provided by the server remotely via the client by an user (col. 10, lines 38-67, i.e. users of multiple remotely distributed computers can access applications of asset utilization expert (of computer Fig. 1, element 30) per the user interface routine), and

for setting up an online communication channel (Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910") maintained for any length of time between the client and server (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56);

first mechanisms (Fig. 32, element 900A-903A) for feeding data of an automation devices into the server via the communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56 and Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910"); and

second mechanisms (Fig. 33, element 914) for linking the applications to the automation devices (col. 35, lines 56-63 and col. 36, lines 10-13),

wherein the first mechanisms have a first interface (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56) to a current communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56) and a second interface to the applications (col. 35, lines 56-63 and col. 36, lines 10-13), and

wherein the first mechanisms are provided for communicating with the second mechanisms via the communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56).

If, however the prior art is interpreted differently by a third party, the base reference and secondary reference teach "using the application provided by the server remotely via the client by an user" as follows:

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Eryurek in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0061323 (hereinafter East).

9. As per claim 21, Eryurek teaches a system for process interfacing within an automation scenario for distributed engineering systems, the system comprising:

a server (Fig. 33, element 912) for providing at least one application required for engineering (col. 35, lines 22-25 and col. 36, lines 37-43 and 50-54);

at least one client (col. 8, lines 56-62, col. 36, lines 28-36 and Fig. 1, element 14A and 30) for:

accessing automation devices (Fig. 1, element 15 and 16) that supply process data and/or project-planning data (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56),

wherein the client is a programmable device (per inherency a client computer is a programmable device), and

for setting up an online communication channel (Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910") maintained for any length of time between the client and server (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56);

first mechanisms (Fig. 32, element 900A-903A) for feeding data of an automation devices into the server via the communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56 and Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910"); and

second mechanisms (Fig. 33, element 914) for linking the applications to the automation devices (col. 35, lines 56-63 and col. 36, lines 10-13),

wherein the first mechanisms have a first interface (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56) to a current communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56) and a second interface to the applications (col. 35, lines 56-63 and col. 36, lines 10-13), and

wherein the first mechanisms are provided for communicating with the second mechanisms via the communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56).

Eryurek teaches to a system substantially the same as Applicant's disclosed system but does not expressly teach using the application provided by the server remotely via the client by an user (col. 10, lines 38-67, i.e. users of multiple remotely distributed computers can access applications of asset utilization expert (of computer Fig. 1, element 30) per the user interface routine).

East teaches the application provided by the server remotely via the client by an user (pg. 1, par. [0001] and pg. 5, par. [0052]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the application provided by the server remotely via the client by an user to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

10. As per claim 23, Eryurek discloses the server is designed as a terminal server for use simultaneously by one or more participants (col. 35, lines 22-25, col. 36, lines 25-36 and Fig. 32, element 900-903).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 22-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 41 and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eryurek in view of East.

13. As per claim 22, Eryurek does not expressly teach the client is a thin client.

East teaches the client is a thin client (pg. 2, par. [0011]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the client is a thin client to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

14. As per claim 23, Eryurek teaches as set forth above the server is designed as a terminal server for use simultaneously by one or more participants (col. 35, lines 22-25, col. 36, lines 25-36 and Fig. 32, element 900-903).

15. As per claim 24, Eryurek teaches the communication channel (Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910") is designed as for transmitting data to one or more participants (Fig. 32, element 900-903) in realtime via one or more separate virtual channels (col. 36, lines 24-28).

Eryurek does not expressly teach to a Remote Desktop Protocol.

East teaches to the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server (Fig. 4, element 210A-B) and client (pg. 5, par. [0055]; i.e. thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server and client to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

16. As per claim 25, Eryurek teaches as set forth above the first mechanisms are provided for feeding data of further automation devices (Fig. 1, element 15 and 16 and Fig. 32, element 900-903) into the server via the communication channel (Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910") via at least one further client (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56, Fig. 1, element 14A and 30 and Fig. 32, element 900-903).

17. As per claim 26, Eryurek teaches as set forth above a transmission of data in the communication channel is provided via an Intranet (col. 8, lines 11-21) and/or an Internet (col. 35, lines 17-21 and 51-56).

18. As per claim 27, Eryurek teaches a transmission of data from the client is provided using a Wireless LAN (col. 37, lines 12-17).

Eryurek does not expressly teach to a Remote Desktop Protocol.

East teaches to the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server (Fig. 4, element 210A-B) and client (pg. 5, par. [0055]; i.e. thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server and client to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

Art Unit: 2121

19. As per claim 28, Eryurek teaches a transmission of data is provided from further data sources (Fig. 32, element 900-903) present in the system using standard protocols such as HTTP (col. 36, lines 50-59).

Eryurek does not expressly teach to a Remote Desktop Protocol.

East teaches to the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server (Fig. 4, element 210A-B) and client (pg. 5, par. [0055]; i.e. thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server and client to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

20. As per claim 29, Eryurek teaches as set forth above the system is provided for use across different sites (col. 35, lines 12-17, col. 35, lines 22-25 and Fig. 32, element 900-903).

21. As per claim 30, Eryurek teaches a method for process interfacing within an automation scenario for distributed engineering systems, the method comprising:

providing an application required for engineering by a server (col. 35, lines 22-25, col. 36, lines 37-43 and 50-54 and Fig. 33, element 912);

accessing automation devices (Fig. 1, element 15 and 16) that supply process data and/or project-planning data (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56) via at least one client (col. 8, lines 56-62, col. 36, lines 28-36 and Fig. 1, element 14A and 30);

setting up an online communication channel (Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910") between the client and the server (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56);

feeding the data of an automation devices into the server via the communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56, Fig. 32, element "the connections between 900-903 and 910");

linking the applications to the automation devices (col. 6, lines 55-67, col. 7, lines 1-5 and col. 8, lines 35-39), wherein communication takes place with a second mechanism (Fig. 1, element 32) via the communication channel (Fig. 32, element "the connections between 902A-904A and 910") via a first mechanism (col. 8, lines 67, col. 9, lines 1-9 and Fig. 1, element 50) having a first interface (col. 12, lines 26-34) to a current communication channel (col. 35, lines 14-21 and 51-56) and a second interface to the applications (col. 35, lines 56-63, col. 36, lines 10-13 and Fig. 33, element 914);
and

using at least one client as a programming device by a user (col. 10, lines 67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

Eryurek does not expressly teach wherein data of further automation devices is fed by the first mechanism into the server via the communication channel via at least one further client and the first means are provided for feeding data of further automation devices into the server over the communication channel via at least one further client and enabling the accessing of automation devices connected to the client from any other client within the system by routing the server making a virtual peer-2-peer communication for direct communication between the participating clients to access and configure one client system from another client system.

East teaches the configuration of one thin client by another thin client via communicating the configuration data of one thin client to another thin client (pg. 2, par. [0011]) via a peer-to-peer network (pg. 3, par. [0035]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the configuration of one thin client by another thin client via communicating the configuration data of one thin client to another thin client via a peer-to-peer network to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory

and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

22. As per claim 32, Eryurek teaches as set forth above one or more participants can use the server simultaneously (col. 35, lines 22-25, col. 36, lines 25-36 and Fig. 32, element 900-903).

23. As per claim 33, Eryurek teaches transmitting data to one or more participants (Fig. 32, element 900-903) in real-time via one or more separate virtual channels is used as the communication channel (col. 36, lines 24-28 and Fig. 32, "the connections between 900-903 and 910").

Eryurek does not expressly teach to a Remote Desktop Protocol.

East teaches to the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server (Fig. 4, element 210A-B) and client (pg. 5, par. [0055]; i.e. thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server and client to

reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

24. As per claim 35, Eryurek teaches as set forth above data is transmitted in the communication channel over an intranet (col. 8, lines 11-21) and/or the Internet (col. 35, lines 17-21 and 51-56).

25. As per claim 36, Eryurek teaches data is transmitted from the client using a Wireless LAN (col. 37, lines 12-17).

Eryurek does not expressly teach to a Remote Desktop Protocol.

East teaches to the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server (Fig. 4, element 210A-B) and client (pg. 5, par. [0055]; i.e. thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server and client to

Art Unit: 2121

reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

26. As per claim 37, Eryurek teaches data from further data sources (Fig. 32, element 900-903) present in the system is transmitted employing standard protocols such as HTTP (col. 36, lines 50-59).

Eryurek does not expressly teach to a Remote Desktop Protocol.

East teaches to the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server (Fig. 4, element 210A-B) and client (pg. 5, par. [0055]; i.e. thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the communication channel is a Remote Desktop Protocol between the server and client to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less

Art Unit: 2121

expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

27. As per claim 38, Eryurek teaches as set forth above the system is used across different sites (col. 35, lines 12-17, col. 35, lines 22-25 and Fig. 32, element 900-903).

28. As per claim 41, Eryurek does not expressly teach the client is a thin client.

East teaches the client is a thin client (pg. 2, par. [0011]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the client is a thin client to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

29. As per claim 42, Eryurek does not expressly teach the thin client depends primarily on the server for processing activities, and mainly focuses on conveying input and output between a user and the server.

East teaches the thin client depends primarily on the server for processing activities (pg. 1, par. [0001]), and mainly focuses on conveying input and output between a user and the server (pg. 1, par. [0001] and pg. 5, par. [0052]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Eryurek to include the thin client depends primarily on the server for processing activities, and mainly focuses on conveying input and output between a user and the server to reduce the total cost of ownership since by not only minimizing the amount of memory and processor power required by the client the machines, they are themselves less expensive than PCs, and also the applications that are accessed by thin clients can be administered and updated from an administrative server (pg. 1, par [0006]).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments pgs. 7-8, filed 17 May 2007 with respect to claim 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach paraphrased limitation, "providing at least one application required for engineering, wherein a programming device is used. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner emphasizes that all anticipated components and limitations of pending claims are present in the prior art as supported below. In addition, the Examiner notes the limitations of "wherein the client is a programming device" and "using the application provided by the server remotely via the client by an user" was newly presented in the Amendment After Non-Final received on 17 May 2007 by the Office, and has been addressed as set forth in the Office Action above.

Eryurek discloses (col. 35, lines 22-25) "As illustrated in FIG. 33, the remote monitoring facility 910 includes a web server 912 through which the processes 900-903 communicate with the remote monitoring facility 910."

(col. 36, lines 37-40) "In this manner, the remote monitoring facility 910 can execute the software for asset, performance, condition and process monitoring as well as executing one or more optimizers for different plants. This, in turn, means that the plants 900-903 do not need to include the processing power or applications for these purposes, which may be less expensive for the plants."

(col. 36, lines 50-54) "If desired, each of the plants 900-903 may update the models 916 stored within the remote monitoring facility 910 applicable to those plants by sending new or updated models to the server 912 using any desired communication format such as XML, HTML, etc."

(col. 10, lines 38-67) "Also, generally speaking, one or more user interface routines 58 can be stored in and executed by one or more of the computers within the plant 10. For example, the computer 30, the user interface 14A, the business system computer 35 or any other computer may run a user interface routine 58. Each user interface routine 58 can receive or subscribe to information from the asset utilization expert 50 and either the same or different sets of data may be sent to each of the user interface routines 58. Any one of the user interface routines 58 can provide different types of information using different screens to different users. For example, one of the user interface routines 58 may provide a screen or set of screens to a control operator or to a business person to enable that person to set constraints or to choose optimization variables for use in a standard control routine or in a control optimizer routine. The user interface routine 58 may provide a control guidance tool that enables a user to view the indices created by the index generation software 51 in some coordinated manner. This operator guidance tool may also enable the operator or any other person to obtain information about the states of devices, control loops, units, etc. and to easily see the information related to the problems with these entities, as that information has been detected by other software within the process plant 10. The user interface routine 58 may also provide performance monitoring screens using performance monitoring data provided by or generated by the tools 23 and 27, the maintenance programs such as the AMS application or any other maintenance

Art Unit: 2121

programs, or as generated by the models in conjunction with the asset utilization expert 50."

In summary, users of multiple remotely distributed computers can access applications of the asset utilization expert per the user interface routine. Hence the Applicant's limitation paraphrased limitation, "providing at least one application required for engineering, wherein a programming device is used.

32. Applicant's arguments see Remarks pgs. 8-9, filed 17 May 2007 with respect to claims 21-23, 25, 26, 29-32, 34, 35 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

33. Applicant's arguments pgs. 9, filed 17 May 2007 with respect to claims 24, 27, 28, 33, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

34. Claims 24, 27, 28, 33, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as set forth above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to remote device management systems.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0106761 discloses a method for conveying process control information between a client process and a server process in a process control system establishes a server process including a plurality of process control services, each of which has a corresponding service interface.

U.S. Patent No. 6,975,914 discloses a user-defined and/or other tasks to be combined in any combination or combinations to specify a workflow.

U.S. Patent No. 6,959,225 discloses a system and method for allocating multi-function resources among a plurality of tasks within a process system in semiconductor wafer fabrication.

U.S. Patent No. 7,047,180 discloses a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture for automating the finding and serving of CAD design data.

Art Unit: 2121

U.S. Patent No. 7,164,956 discloses a remote operation management system for commercial appliances.

U.S. Patent No. 7,181,291 discloses a method and an apparatus for controlling a household appliance controlled using an internal control unit.

U.S. Patent No. 6,853,920 discloses a system for monitoring an industrial process and taking action based on the results of process monitoring.

PCT Application No. 2000/54149 discloses a computer network comprising a client and a server, wherein a client session is initiated.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2121

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer L. Norton whose telephone number is 571-272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121